

**REMARKS**

The undersigned representative respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 4-17, and 20-30 are pending. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 18, and 19 have been cancelled.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-12, 15, 17-22, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare et al. (US 2005/0015772) (“Saare”) in view of Omori et al. (US 2002/0184405) (“Omori”).

To more clearly define the invention, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Similarly independent claim 17 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 18 and 19. Amended claim 1 is provided as follows:

A method for managing workflow for an application, comprising:  
obtaining an application adapter associated with the application,  
wherein the application adapter specifies a sub-task;  
monitoring the application to obtain a state; ~~and~~  
performing an action associated with the sub-task, if the state is  
associated with the sub-task;  
authenticating a user;  
retrieving a profile associated with the user, if the user is  
authenticated,  
wherein the profile comprises the application adapter; and  
wherein the profile is an single sign-on profile.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Saare or Omori, individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention. The Examiner concedes that Saare does not explicitly disclose, “... monitoring the application to obtain a state ...” and “... if the state

is associated with the sub-task ...,” as they are recited within the context of the other limitations of claim 1, but asserts that Omori discloses these limitations and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saare and Omori.

This assertion is respectfully traversed. The mere fact that a prior art reference could be modified to meet each and every limitation of the claim is insufficient to establish obviousness. Here, it is respectfully submitted that the piecemeal combination of Saare and Omori is insufficient to provide the motivation to combine certain prior art teachings while ignoring other teachings to arrive at the invention recited in claim 1. These arguments are also applicable to corresponding claim 17.


Claims 13, 14, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare in view of Omori, and further in view of Pace et al. (US 2003/0101223) (“Pace”). Because these claims depend from independent claims 1 or 17, the arguments presented above with respect to claims 1 and 17 are also applicable to claims 13, 14, 23 and 24.

### **CONCLUSION**

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative at the number listed below. Furthermore, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account No. 501458.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/2/07  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
Suite 900  
607 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 508-5800

By:   
John W. Ball Jr. # 44,433